

CITY OF BELMONT

PLANNING COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2007, 7:00 PM

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Parsons, Horton, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer, Wozniak
Commissioners Absent: Frautschi

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), Senior Planner DiDonato (SP), Associate Planner Walker (AP), Contract Planner Ouse (CP), Zoning Technician Gill (ZT), City Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS).

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS

CDD de Melo suggested moving items 6C, 2122 Ralston Avenue, and 6D, 968 Ralston Avenue, ahead of item 6B, 1000 O'Neill Avenue on the agenda. Commission approved by consent.

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments) - None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

4A. Minutes of 4/3/07

4B. Minutes of 4/17/07

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to accept the Minutes of April 3, 2007 as presented.

Ayes: Wozniak, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer, Parsons
Noes: None
Abstain: Horton
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 5/0/1/1

MOTION: By Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to accept the Minutes of April 17, 2007 as presented.

Ayes: Mercer, McKenzie, Horton, Mayer, Wozniak, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

5. OLD BUSINESS:

5A. 905 South Road – Sidewalk/Front Entry and Landscape/Irrigation Plan

SP DiDonato summarized the staff Memorandum, recommending approval subject to the additional conditions as stated in the Memorandum and answering questions from the Commission.

Simmie Graves, owner/applicant, clarified that when they started this project it was requested by the Commission that that he provide a refuge where people could step off the street rather than a full-blown sidewalk. He mistakenly called it a sidewalk in his submittals, whereas it should have been called a pathway. The railing material will probably be a metal that will not decompose and will be in the Craftsman theme.

Commissioner Horton suggested that the path be composed of Designated Gravel.

There was no one in the audience wishing to speak on this item.

Commissioner Mercer expressed concern that, because of the extreme slope, a large number tall of Redwoods would become a hazard for the downhill property. Commissioner Horton commented that Redwoods were chosen because the downhill neighbors wanted a screen.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not the 8" Oak tree, designated as #3 on the plans, could be saved. David Widelock, landscape architect for the project, stated that it will be very difficult to build the house and preserve the Oak because it is so close to the house. He did not have a problem with modifying the irrigation system to preserve the Oak. Mr. Graves pointed out that a condition of approval calls for them to provide some kind of barrier at the bottom of the hill and he has identified a type of barrier that can be filled with sand or water that would also impact the location of that tree. He believed the tree will get damaged beyond salvage during construction and preferred to take it out.

MOTION: By Commissioner McKenzie, seconded by Commissioner Wozniak, to adopt the resolution approving the Final Landscape/Irrigation Plan for 905 South Road (Appl. No. 2002-0061) with the added conditions that the path be constructed with Designated Gravel, it is not to be constructed to Public Works sidewalk standards but as a point of refuge only, and to make every effort to retain the 8" Oak Tree designated as #3.

Ayes: McKenzie, Wozniak, Horton, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

5B. 2996 Hallmark Drive – Landscape Plan

CDD de Melo summarized the staff memorandum, recommending approval of the Landscape Plan as amended to increase the size of the Coast Redwoods to 24" box.

Discussion ensued.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to adopt the resolution approving a Property Frontage Landscape Plan for 2996 Hallmark Drive, with the following added conditions: Three Coast Redwood trees increased to 24", the addition of crushed gravel or stone around the bus stop and the signal control boxes, repair and maintenance of the irrigation system, the expansion of the plan to include the area adjacent to the hammerhead driveway, and to detail the Pines that are on the plans by the driveway.

Ayes: Wozniak, Horton, Mayer, McKenzie Mercer, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

6A. PUBLIC HEARING – Design Review for Façade Improvements at 240 El Camino Real

To confirm an administrative Design Review approval allowing site plan and exterior elevation improvements for the existing "WorkSpace Innovations" commercial building located at 240 El Camino Real. The proposal

meets Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) and Architectural Theme & Treatment Policy (ATTP) guidelines and Belmont Zoning Ordinance regulations. The applicant is seeking this approval in conjunction with a façade rebate request to be considered by the Belmont Redevelopment Agency.
(Appl. No. 2006-0052) CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15301(d) – Restoration or Rehabilitation of deteriorated or damaged structures. Applicant: Keith and Laurie Tinyo

AP Walker summarized the staff report, recommending confirmation of the Administrative Design Review approval and adoption of the attached Resolution.

Discussion ensued regarding the condition of the property, particularly that tall shrubs are dying and not getting watered, there are 6" weeds growing through the cracks in the sidewalk, and the parking lot is in need of attention. CDD de Melo agreed to relay these concerns to the applicant.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward to speak.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed by voice vote.

AP Walker noted that the applicant was unable to find a contractor to stripe the parking lot because of the grade, adding that there is no place to put an ADA-compliant space.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, adopting the resolution confirming an Administrative Design Review approval for 240 El Camino Real (Appl. No. PA2006-0052) with the addition that the applicant irrigate and maintain the existing landscape.

Ayes: Wozniak, McKenzie, Horton, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

Chair Parsons stated that this item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 calendar days.

6C. PUBLIC HEARING – 2122 Ralston Avenue

To consider a Single Family Design Review to construct a 1,301 square addition to the existing 1,811 square foot single-family residence for a total of 3,112 square feet that is below the zoning district permitted 3,124 square feet for the site. (Appl. No. 2007-0007)

APN: 044-274-060; Zoned: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant: Paul Wong

Owner: Ted Gouzelis

ZT Gill summarized the staff report, recommending approval with the conditions attached.

CDD de Melo confirmed that the Zone Text Amendments recommended by the Commission at their last meeting has not yet been before the City Council for adoption; therefore the current application does not need to conform to the amended zone text.

Project Architect Paul Wang described the project, noting that they responded to the concern of neighbors regarding views, privacy and sunlight by using story poles and changing the design to relocate the large windows. They also worked with staff to increase the amount of landscaping and reduce the amount of hardscape. Responding to Chair Parsons' question, he stated that the present floor to ceiling height is 8'.

Ted Gouzelis, owner, stated that they had tried to address the concerns of the neighbors and hoped they had come to a satisfactory resolution.

Gurcan Ozmert, neighbor on Ralston Avenue, presented pictures to the Commission and stated that the project will affect him negatively. He felt that a concrete wall next to his swimming pool will be like living in an apartment complex rather than a single-family house, and the second-story addition will affect his sunlight, airflow and privacy. He will feel like he is in jail. He believes the subject house does not have the correct setback and that his property value will go down. He would have no objection if the proposed design was thirty feet from the back wall.

Jennifer Nunes, neighbor on Coronet Blvd., stated that the project would obstruct some of the views from her living area, and presented pictures to confirm this opinion.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed by voice vote.

Commissioner Wozniak found the design to be boxy, and agreed with the neighbor who felt it would be like living in an apartment house, adding for Ms. Nunes that private views are not protected in Belmont.

Chair Parsons called attention to drawing A3.1, noting that the proposal is for an 11' ceiling in the new first floor and a 9' ceiling on the second floor, and that the front door and the windows almost dwarf the garage doors to scale, which gives it a boxy, bulky appearance. Mr. Wong responded that the 11' is floor to floor; the ceilings are 10' on the living room level and there is a 1'9" elevation change between the garage and the main living level.

Commissioner Mercer stated that in a regular street setting she would not be able to make the finding for bulk but because it is next door to an even bulkier commercial type building it fits in. She thought that it would significantly reduce the bulk if it were stepped back from the lot line and lowered somewhat.

Commissioner Horton did not have an issue with the house, taking into consideration the two buildings it sits between. She noted that it is 2' lower than the maximum height and they are not building out from the footprint.

Commissioner Mayer had no problem with the design, but given the fact that the neighbors feel as they do he would be in favor of doing anything they can to lower the profile.

Chair Parsons liked the floor plan but suggested that if there is a way they can reduce the floor-to-ceiling height of the first floor by a foot he would have a much easier time finding for the issue of bulk.

Commissioner McKenzie had difficulty with the building bulk and the following design elements in the front:

- 1) There was too much tile and he would like to see some other way to handle the first layer of roof over the second floor windows;
- 2) Since this is to be in the Spanish design mode, he felt that iron railings would be preferable to wooden railing on the deck;
- 3) Decks over garages are a recipe for maintenance disaster; and
- 4) the eave of the garage roof looks like it's protruding into the front door.

Commissioner Mayer called attention to what appeared to be a post right in the center of the front porch. Mr. Wang responded that it is an existing post and they will review it.

Mr. Gouzelis asked the Commission to take into account the office building that is directly next to his house, noting that cars parked in their parking stalls are at the roof level of his house, and only the roof of his house is visible from that building.

MOTION: By Commissioner Horton to adopt the resolution approving a Single-Family Design Review at 2122 Ralston Avenue (Appl. No. 2007-0007) with the conditions attached.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, that the Single-Family Design Review at 2122 Ralston Avenue (Appl. No. 2007-0007) be continued to a date uncertain for redesign, with the intention of reducing the bulk, perhaps by reducing the height of some of the floors.

Ayes: Wozniak, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer
Noes: Horton, Parsons
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 4/2/1

6D. PUBLIC HEARING – Design Review for Façade Improvements at 968 Ralston Avenue

To consider a Design Review request to allow exterior elevation improvements (construction of an awning) for the existing commercial/office building located at 968 Ralston Avenue. The proposal meets Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) and Architectural Theme & Treatment Policy (ATTP) guidelines and Belmont Zoning Ordinance regulations. The applicant is seeking this approval in conjunction with a façade rebate request to be considered by the Belmont Redevelopment Agency.

(Appl. No. 2006-0003) CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15301(d) – Restoration or Rehabilitation of deteriorated or damaged structures. Applicant: Vincenzo Cucco

AP Walker summarized the staff report, recommending confirmation of the Administrative Design Review and approval of the revised Design Review Request, subject to the attached conditions. She clarified that the façade improvement applies to the restaurant only, while the proposed awning will extend to each of the three building tenants.

Discussion ensued as to whether items (f) and (g) should be included in the staff report and proposed resolution. The original façade improvement and the awning were approved by consensus of the Commission, and CDD de Melo agreed to clean up the resolution for the Commission's June 5th meeting.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak.

MOTION: By Commissioner Horton, seconded by Commissioner Wozniak, to close the public hearing. Motion carried by voice vote.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to continue to June 5 date certain Confirmation of an Administrative Design Review Approval and Seeking Approval of a new Design Review Request for 968 Ralston Avenue (Appl. No. PA2006-0003) for cleanup of language regarding the planters and for inquiry with Pubic Works about the paving as mentioned in items (f) and (g) of the proposed resolution.

Ayes: Horton, Wozniak, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

Chair Parsons called for a 5-minute recess.

6B. PUBLIC HEARING – 1000 O'NEILL AVENUE (Continued from May 1, 2007 P/C Meeting)

To consider a Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) and Rezone to establish a Planned Development (PD) Zoning District, and certification of a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for relocation and rehabilitation of the historic Emmett House. The Emmett House is proposed to relocate from a commercial site at 843 Ralston to a vacant site at 1000 O'Neill Avenue and be rehabilitated into two below-market rate residential units. Site improvements include construction of a two-car detached garage, landscaping and reconfiguration of Sixth Avenue and abandonment of a portion of O'Neill Avenue to provide additional land area on the project site through the abandonment of excess right-of-way. Belmont Creek meanders through the north half of the site. (Appl. No. 2006-0090)

Current Zoning: R-1B (Single-Family Residential); Proposed Zoning: (PD) Planned Development
APN: 045-181-230, 260, & 280; CEQA Status: Mitigated Negative Declaration
APPLICANT/OWNER: City of Belmont. PROJECT PLANNER: Andrea Ouse, (650) 333-3973

CP Ouse summarized the staff report, pointing out changes that had been made since the May 1st meeting, and answered questions from the Commission.

Sheila McElroy, Principal of Circa: Historic Property Development, a consulting firm on historic preservation and cultural resource issues, explained that the Emmett House is a historic resource and made the following points:

- The new use as a residential duplex is highly appropriate and one that she would professionally propose.
- On the issue of relocation, the importance of setting comes into bear. Setting is how a building relates to its surroundings; in this review they looked at the historic setting vs. the new setting for compatibility.
- The proposed site is a very good fit and any orientation other than the current plan would be an impact because of the false sense of historic development as well as false representation of how Emmett chose to portray his social status, meaning it is a relatively modest residence.
- Following the current proposal would avoid a significant impact and would allow the project to move forward using the Negative Declaration.
- Responding to Chair Parsons' question as to whether the property, if moved to the proposed location, would qualify for National Registry listing, Ms. McElroy stated that she does not work for the State Historical Inventory Preservation Operations SHIPO office but could say that it would still be eligible. The houses that have been moved of which she is aware have not chosen to go for the National Register but for the California and local registers. She did not know of any houses that have been moved that are on the National Register but she could get a list.
- Chair Parsons stated that the house has local significance but questioned whether SHIPO even considers the property as being historic since they made no comments. Ms. McElroy responded that she felt confident that, in light of the commercial development around it at its current location, by replacing the porch and relocating the Emmett house to the proposed site in the orientation that is proposed, the City would actually be increasing the integrity of the Emmett House, and it would have a much more likelihood of being on the California or National Registers.
- When relocating a historic resource into an existing historic district there are issues about integrity on the district. This is a situation where they are relocating a historic resource adjacent to a historic residential district so that they are almost returning the house to its more original setting, which would have been the residences' approximate various ages as opposed to where it is right now.
- Chair Parsons felt that there is a chance that putting the house on a street that has 3 or 4 historic homes of similar ilk could have a chance to have a setting that is more enhancing for relocation. Ms. McElroy disagreed, pointing to a 1913 Sandborn map where the Emmett House is shown on Ralston on a very large parcel and adjacent to it are some commercial buildings and across the way is a little alley way. Looking at the proposed site, the Emmett House would be located on a corner again with the front elevation facing the street and with a street that almost mimics the alley way, concluding that the setting on the proposed location with the orientation of the front façade parallel to the street is going to get as near as you can get to perfect in an urban environment. She added that angling the front elevation or turning it completely around is almost "off the charts" in relationship to the original setting or original orientation. She was very pleased with the proposed orientation and setting.
- Responding to Chair Parsons' inquiry about her background, she stated that she has her Masters in Historic Preservation from the University of Pennsylvania, worked in the Mainstreet program, which is a stepchild of the National Trust, for eight years, and has been in private practice as a historic preservation consultant for over eight years.

As a point of clarification, CDD de Melo stated that the Emmett House has a Landmark classification in association with the Belmont Historic Resource Inventory of March 1993.

CP Ouse distributed copies of Ms. McElroy's resume.

Chair Parsons confirmed with staff that SHIPO had not provided any comments to the environmental study, and that staff would take their cues from the RDA relative to whether they want to pursue historic preservation efforts with the State.

Regarding the site plans, CP Ouse stated that the standardizing of the width of Sixth Avenue from north heading south across the bridge requires that the wood fence be eliminated as well as removal of approximately four Eucalyptus trees that would be in the path of pavement. She clarified that the garage was originally planned as a 4-car garage that has been reduced to a 2-car garage.

Responding to Commissioner Wozniak's question regarding a fence that connects the house to the garage, Mike Garavalia, principal with Garavalia Architecture, Inc., explained that they are trying to create a private and safe yard for tenants that would be acceptable to the City.

Chair Parsons reopened the public hearing.

Denny Lawhern, resident of Hiller Street and representing the Belmont Historical Society, recalled that the Belmont City Councils over the years made a policy decision naming the Emmett House as a local historic resource and to move and preserve it for future generations. He believed the staff report, the consultant's report and the State Historic Guidelines are very clear on the orientation issue that if the Commission selects any other site plan than the original plan that faces O'Neill Avenue they may be creating a situation that could jeopardize the future designation of the building with the State Registry, and potentially the Federal Registry. He urged the Commission to move ahead with this item and pass it on to the City Council.

Aldo Trevisan, resident of O'Neill Avenue next door to the subject property, made the following points:

- He would like to see the large Eucalyptus trees that adjoin his property cut down.
- He is opposed to a creekside trail and passive recreation as discussed on page 11 of the staff report as it would ruin his back yard. He has squirrels and birds and a lot of growth in the creek, and he does not want it to look denuded like the creek at Twin Pines.
- He believes that residents will be parking on the street, and the street is very narrow. A car parked on each side of the street would make problems for fire trucks getting through.
- If the right-of-way is abandoned for this property so they can get more square footage, he wants the same privilege for himself and his neighbor.

Nancy Oliver, San Carlos resident and representing the Historic Preservation Section of the San Carlos Branch of AAUW and member of the Belmont Historical Society, spoke to the importance of retaining the historic integrity of the house and its eligibility for possible listing on the National or State Register. She added that usually interior changes do not come into play when they are considering any kind of eligibility unless it would be something like Ralston Hall, where the interior is such that you would want to preserve it. She felt that siting the house as originally proposed would show the house and the porch in its very best light and urged the Commission to approve the original siting plan to front the Emmett House on to O'Neill

Hartley Laughead, resident of Sequoia Way, referred to a conversation she had had with Kent Seavy, a preservation consultant, Monterey County Historic coordinator and curator of the California History Society, who pointed out that, under CEQA and the California Registry of Historic Properties, a house that is moved should be oriented as closely as possible as it was originally. She urged the Commission to take this into consideration.

David Long, resident of South Road and owner of a historic property, was excited to see such important treatment given to the historic landmark and hoped that all such properties get this kind of attention and level of expertise, including his own home should it come before the Commission. He urged the Commission to select the option that has Emmett House fronting O'Neill with the front porch facing South towards San Carlos, and quoted references to support his request. He added that he thinks the aesthetic value to Belmont is crucial to consider. History aside, he thinks the facing to O'Neill is an elegant way to have this project sited and will be a fantastic addition to Belmont and this corner.

Dolores Callagy, resident of Davey Glen Road and member of the County and Belmont Historical Associations, stated that she speaks to school children about the Ohlone Indians, noting that the creek that runs through Twin Pines is where their history was, and she believes the Emmett House would be very comfortable there. People visiting the History Room in Twin Pines could stop down the street and look for this very historical building. She made the point that the Eucalyptus trees are not native to Belmont.

MOTON: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed by voice vote.

Commissioners gave the following rationales for their decisions:

- Commissioner Wozniak
 - o Liked the orientation to O'Neill and felt that the historians pointing out that the original house was facing another street and alley confirmed the historic placement.

- o View of porch will be very attractive when coming up Sixth Avenue.
- o Back of the house will be mostly covered by trees.
- o The other orientations do not take quite as good advantage of the house and could leave them open to needing another Negative Declaration and CEQA analysis.

- Commissioner Mercer

- o Doubts that in moving the structure it is going to retain its historic integrity.
- o It will be an almost mirror image of what it was.
- o Doubts that the construction materials are going to be original, or even will be facsimiles, and doubts that the Redevelopment Agency has the budget to do that kind of handmade craftsmanship. It is her understanding that they need to restore every little fenestration, etc.
- o Whether it really retains its "historic integrity" almost becomes a moot point; it doesn't have integrity where it is now so whether it retains it or not, it can't be any worse.
- o It achieves the RDA objective of providing multifamily housing and kills two birds with one stone by effectively utilizing an empty lot and freeing up a commercial space in a more appropriate area.
- o Can completely make the findings with respect to the Conceptual Development Plan.
- o She personally did not like the straight orientation onto O'Neill but was willing to defer to the opinion of experts, not because she thought it would retain its historic integrity but because it is certainly better than it is now and something has to be done with it.

- Commissioner McKenzie

- o Would prefer to see the property facing Sixth Avenue to be in a better relationship with the other historic homes in that neighborhood, but recognized that Sixth Avenue is not straight – it meanders and siting it that way causes a negative effect.
- o He wondered if their advisors would site it facing Sixth Avenue if it were straightened out, but did not believe that would happen.
- o This project has been studied for a long time and they've had the benefit of many advisors, consultants and planners, and believed that the Commission should listen to them and site it to front on O'Neill as has been recommended.

- Commissioner Mayer

- o He came into the process late and felt that at the last meeting they did not have the background presented in a way that was germane to the decision they were making.
- o The City has obviously made a major commitment here and hired consultants in a well organized process, so felt it was incumbent upon the Commission to follow the recommendations of the consultants.
- o After further study, he felt that fronting it on to O'Neill Avenue would give it the best possible view from all sides. He is in favor of going back to Option 1.

- Commissioner Horton

- o Had no problem with facing it on O'Neill but also had questions about whether it will actually qualify for historic but believed they should preserve the house.
- o Somewhat concerned about its proximity to the creekbank but someone will have to address that at another time.
- o Was prepared to approve the recommendation.

- Chair Parsons

- o Favored Commissioner Mercer's point of view.
- o Responding to emails he had received about his qualifications to consider historic preservation, he provided the following background information:
- o Has been working in environmental planning and physical planning for 35 years
- o Has probably prepared and or oversaw several hundred environmental documents, both CEQA and NEPA that went to SHIPO and to Washington on historic buildings.
- o Was responsible in his last job for trying to save the only historic house on Treasure Island that is on the National Register, the Admiral Nimitz House, from CalTrans putting ramps all the way around.
- o Was responsible for closing out a major museum and making sure that the artifacts were safely stored in humidity controlled space and with the appropriate materials that would not chemically react.
- o Has worked for the National Park Service in very historic places, grew up in a historic area, and spent his summers exploring old houses along the Chesapeake Bay.
- o His family has an existing museum in Pennsylvania near Legonier, the Kinsey family museum, a compilation of 4 buildings that were restored to be totally accurate. The problem is that they moved the log house and therefore it was turned down by the State and the National Registry for listing.
- o In all the years that he has worked in this area he only knew of one building that was moved successfully

and made the National Register.

- o Contrary to what other people have said in emails, he has always had an open mind about this project and he and the other person who was attacked personally were not the ones who asked that they look at alternatives angling the house, but he was supportive of the idea.

- o He believed that either orientation would accomplish the City's goal

- o He wished he was wrong but did not think it will be eligible for historic listing.

MOTON: By Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner Horton to adopt the resolution recommending Redevelopment Agency Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance for Establishment of a Planned Development Zone and Relocation and Rehabilitation of a Two-Unit Residential Structure and Construction of a Two-Car Detached Garage at 1000 O'Neill Avenue (Appl. No. 06-0090)

Ayes: Mercer, Horton, Mayer, McKenzie, Wozniak, Parsons

Noes: None

Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to adopt the Resolution recommending City Council adoption of a Conceptual Development Plan and Rezone to Planned Development for Relocation and Rehabilitation of a Two-Unit Residential Structure and Construction of a Two-Car Detached Garage at 1000 O'Neill Avenue (Appl. No. 06-0090), with amendments to the resolution as follows:

1) Page 1 of the Resolution, fifth paragraph, change to read "WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after consideration of all testimony and reports, thereby determines that the proposed Rezoning of the subject property to Planned Development (PD) and associated Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) for the proposed Emmett House relocation and rehabilitation project achieves the objectives of the Zoning Plan and General Plan for the City for the following reasons:..."

2) Page 3 of the Resolution, under item 4., change to read "The proposed site design would front the Emmett House in a parallel fashion along O'Neill Avenue. This orientation would provide an elegant entrance into the neighborhood."

Ayes: Wozniak, McKenzie, Horton, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons

Noes: None

Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

7. REPORTS, STUDIES AND UPDATES:

CDD de Melo reported as follows:

7A. Avanti Pizza Commercial Center – 2040 Ralston Ave.

No landscape plan received as yet. The applicant has plans and is working with his contractor.

7B. U-Haul – 530 El Camino Real

The two Redwood trees that are located within their respective planting areas are starting to look better. Irrigation system is still undetermined and there is a tree missing. Fines may start to be part of this action.

7C. Mid-Peninsula Water District Properties – Folger Drive and Ralston Avenue

As reported at the last meeting, they are looking at some potential landscape plan enhancements for their pump station plant on Ralston Avenue and to have some tree replacements for the ones that have been removed for their Folger Drive property. They were receptive to some plantings and there is a landscape plan that will come to the City that will consist largely of trees.

7D. Motel 6

Staff is continuing to work with security, which is committed to a 7-day detail, and the property owner is getting closer to a master plan for that entire site.

7E. NDNU Field Soccer/Lacrosse Field

There is a task force meeting scheduled for May 23rd .

Commissioner Wozniak noticed that the Crossings Church on the Alameda between Chula Vista and El Verano has been having problems with the signage. They took down a big sign down and put another one on the fence, which now has graffiti on it. The signage on their building also appears to be excessive.

Commissioner Wozniak raised the issue of the clear cutting of foliage at the 101/Ralston interchange. Chair Parsons asked that this issue be put on a future agenda as there has been no feedback from Public Works about the Commission's earlier recommendation.

Commissioner Mercer asked for an update on the sidewalk replacement plan that was rejected by the Commission and the City Council, noting that it will be relevant to the Emmett House relocation plans.

CDD de Melo announced that the Planning Commission meetings are going to be televised beginning with the June 5th meeting. He had forwarded emails to the Commission regarding suggested protocol and asked that any questions be forward to him, the City Attorney or IT. CA Zafferano will also be sending an email with suggestions for using the microphones, etc.

Several Commissioners stated that they are unable to access their City email accounts. The problem will be referred to IT.

8. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2007

Liaison: Chair Parsons

Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Horton

Chair Parsons will be unable to attend the meeting. Commissioner Horton agreed to attend.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, June 5, 2007, at 7:00 p.m. in Belmont City Hall.

Carlos de Melo
Planning Commission Secretary

CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the
Community Development Department.

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.